Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

ents in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking cket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies of procesures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of also discussed in the NPRM if enacted, would do so — and must not be adopted. "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from (1) people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates (Religious the advisors who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures of	or policies discussed above.
Josaleen Boldt Signature	March 15, 2008
Rosaleen Boldt	805 E 11 67501 Address
Name	620 663+6763 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

420 Meadowbrook Drive Danville, KY 40422 March 10, 2008

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Attention: Chief, Media Bureau

MB Docket # 04-233

Dear Chief.

I am writing to protest this so-called "Fairness" bill that our federal Congress is considering. I understand that early on in broadcasting, there was a fairness law so that both sides of an issue could be presented. But for the last 20 years, there has been no need for this bill because there are enough radio and TV stations out there that all views are represented. However, in the last few years, there have been several efforts to resurrect this old fairness doctrine, which to me seems kind of silly. Can you imagine listening to your favorite radio or TV talk show host, giving one side of an issue, and then turning around and saying, and now a word from our opponents!"

Actually, it might not be so bad for people to hear both sides of an issue. But what I am afraid of is that the conservatives will have to honor this new law, but the liberals will find a way around it. I think this is just one more attempt by those who want to cleanse our society and our nation from every mention of any Judgo-Christian perspective in our history and our culture. I have seen how "religious cleansing" is taking place in our national parks and public places for quite some time, and you can see how our social structure is crumbling without the strong influence of God. I pray that you will not give in to the demands of those who want to silence the Christians. Do not let our free speech rights be violated!

Sincerely,

Marie Laland
Mrs. Marie Garland

NOONO STRVICES DIVISION

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

Received & Inspected
MAR 2 4 5 709

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Maynaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008 in MR Decision. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio-stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) Engree The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Signature of where a station so the cur and the best of the By Constant Control 1831 and 1816	53936
個je (it aux) などでの must constablish a two-tiered streams syor くっかい このはなってきた。 at sometice y committee to the wai application processed. The proposition is to the proposition in the following processed in the following processed in the proposition is to the following phone between the processed in the proposition in the processed in the processe	Million (Million (Mil
Company and the control of the contr	
Organization ((Fany)) ecosis serve de la Republication (Fany) ecosis (Fa	

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MAR 2 4 2209

FCC Mail Room

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Decket No. 94-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of 'religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Michelle Encyl
Signature

Michelle ERNEST

Name

Homeowner Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

Phone

.

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Che

To released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

The violate First Amendment rights. A number of Proposed Rulemaking Che

To violate First Amendment rights. A number of Proposed Rulemaking Che

To violate First Amendment rights. A number of Proposed Rulemaking Che

To violate First Amendment rights. "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who are their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be (4) automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Keneen Jones	3/16/08 Date
Signature U	-
Rebeccu Jones	7143 N.154 G. Dhoeny, AZ 85020 Address
Name	(602) 861-4080 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

DOID SCHVICE Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking **MB Docket No. 04-233**

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice (*), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. roposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must got violate First Amendment of the contract of the c

proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious proadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5) stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

vve urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or pol	licies discussed above.
Joan Litzl Signature	March 17, 08
Joan Gitzel	N8854 Hwy26 Address Eldorado, WI
Name	920-872-2809 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemakin "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so -- and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways; (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest: -

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

Name

Title (if any)

conceptore is out to

anization (thany)

were the force production of their second of the

70

ार्ड कर्ना का रहार प्रकृत रहे हैं। इस अपने के महिला के **महिला कि उ**

Company of the opposite that he does

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rule haking one "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-2335

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

	•
Marry 1/2 Johnson Signature	3/18/08 Date
A more appropalate round funce se	
Nancy H. Johnson Pour wests	Address nid Marsh Wisc. 53936
Name Name	(2) 当事によるとは、2011年のある。がは、
Sweat Grandmistres were	Sing controlling the sent only in the set got they Sing a director unling raine range of they Sing a director unling raine range of they Sing a director unling raine and they Sing a director unline
in the Complex of Legitaling Complex of Papilicants by the Com	TO A STREET OF A STREET PROOF SO VESTIONAL STREETS STREETS STREET
contambilidate barde, from to una renewal replicat	answal of the proposed it besides and the solution of the sol
Organization (if any)	a sugt of course which contain lineaus, was usuffer
organization in diffy	er en

C. WRILS DIVISION Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Received & Inspected MB Docket No. 04-233 I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Mannaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-2835 Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of als discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted. The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from (1)people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster. particularly a religious broadcaster, must present. The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message deliverymandates on any religion. The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of firegramming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices. The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings. Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest. We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above. Signature eginnings Christian Community Chu

istich C

ાં submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Bronosed Repentedking (the NPRM"), released Jan 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be appointed all Roun

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks—and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

I have a warmill

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

signature and Date

Jennifer Doniels, Sani River, St. Supply, N.C. 28462

Name and Address

Mail By April 14, 2008 to:

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Attn: Chief, Media Bureau

Received & Inspected Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulenjaking MAR 2 4 2009

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Netice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and rough not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and level loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barifed from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they confessioned to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5). Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Date
Signature

Po Box 1 Selfridge ND 58668
Address

Name

701-422-3436

Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (r/any)

MAR 242008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Lobatism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FGC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Rroposed public access requirements would be so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCG must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review officertain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Laston C. Hyde

Signature

Date

2602 Millen Ln.

Address

Name

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

MAR 2 4 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rule making, 5/

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 24-233...

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences mather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Americal from the programming including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any; religion:
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Signature	<u>nar-</u>	3-17-08 Date
Shelby)	MOORE	6207 Riney Rd Novavod Mo 65917 Address
Name	: : t,	419-146-475/ Phone
Title (if any)	 	
Organization (if ar	ıv)	

Received & Inspected

MAR 2 4 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so — and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

And I'm the of the State of the first Marie (factor)

	i
rate out also case, more parameter of the office of the Date	•
Signature	
Pairing over with the E proposals & out 11015 on the will be the second of the	1 N/C 7/786
Doughos Allen Andrew Address Address	le, pocario
Name Value Carago 1 2 42 - 9600	,
Phone Phone	
The state of the s	,
Title (if any) and analytic out of the second the secon	•
्राप्त के कि	X 3
والأراز والمراوع والموافق والمراوع والم	

(4) 46 36 46

Organization (if any)

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Convision MB Docket No. 04-233

MAR 242008

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Rill Room "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-23

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Bill	Kijsp	·	March 15,200 8
Signature	-	-	11/1 Black Rd Thomasuille N. G Address 27360
Name			(336) 472-7350
156 a		٠,	Phone.
Title (if any)	:		and the second of the second o
State 1889			
Organization (if	any)		

Received & Inspected

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localistic Netice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. b: 50

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious proadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory boatd proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be (4) automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5) stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Christina Kern	3/13/08
Signature	Date
Christina Kem	Address
Name	
,	Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

Received & Inspected

MAR 242008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

FOC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendmen origings. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

Signature Signature	3-15-08 Date
Jeannette K.O'Reithy	6957 Ft. Deposit Dr. Address Pensacola, FL 32526
Name	850-944-6192 Phone
Title (if any)	
Organization (if any)	

" VISIA

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

MAR 242008

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-232.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from (1) people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice (3) of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain-classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5) stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially-raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature ç ¢ E office. 'N': is the Many of Januar Llandel. Name

allow the year

and select the selection stay fine and purish single from and enclosibly the contraction and processing in the contraction of 4300 et is by the Commins one is thomseives. About any june latter from the mark wall application processing. The proposed in the William is used Figs. Inustinct establishing to some expension system in which of have

The Control of the Later of Charles of the development of the

Aprilor of an admin at the or Organization (it any). ວຊານດີ ດະວາ A IT & DECIS CONTRACTOR

IN THE YOUR STATES THE STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF T 1 1. 1 the little decision beams to come a Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rule making wed 8 Inspected
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rule making (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violete First American Inspected Inspe proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted. The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from (1) people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present. The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion. The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices. (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings. Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest. We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above. 2905 mossy meadow Dr. High Point, NC 27265 John T. ShiELds Name

Title (if anv)

Organization (if any)

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proc MB Docket No. 04 233

FCC Mail Room I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious proadcasters, to take advice from (1) people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion. ningous con
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice (3)of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be (4) automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular (5) stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and. (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

ે. સાઇવંટ

We urge the FCC not to a	adopt rules, procedure	es or policies discusse	d above.	
Signature	Jamo ₁	Date (1) 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	108	
Linda Anteza	part e	70 Tond Address si	_	, ko, NC 27926
Name		GU - (G)	ida 📑 🚉	
Title (if any)	n dae se in eastean de se de la composition della composition de la composition della composition della composition dell	ar र स्थापकाठकाठा मुहार १८४ को है को लेखिलायाठ, सुराहित से स्थल	e de proposes de la seculit La companya de la seculit La companya de la constanta	と 1. およ .1. サ新
•		•		

் வெள்ள கொள்ளிர்

Received & Inspected

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster. particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks - and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedur	res or policies discussed above.	
signature Steve O'Reilly	3/15/08 Date 6957 Ft. Deposit Dr Address	Pensacila, Fl 32526
Name '	STO 944-6192 Phone	
Title (if any) Organization (if any)		

MAR 242008



FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localizm Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so and must not be adopted?

The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from

- The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice frein those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences; rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Organization (if any)

	•
Britany Hicks	3-15-08 Date
Signature —	5 Pinehurst Mana- Apt. A Pinehurst, NC Address 28374
Brittany Becoley Hicks	Address 28374
Name	910-315-1041 Phone
Title (if any)	

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rule making MB Docket No. 04-233

MAR 242008

FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 104, 233

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what view points a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC <u>must not</u> turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages that correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many-Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

WILLIAM W. & ALICE A. STOUFFER 120 HIGHLAND AVENUE HOLLIDAYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 16648

Received & Inspected

MAR 242008

FCC Mail Room

March 13, 2008

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554
Aftn: Chief, Media Bureau

FCENED

, D 6:50

RE:

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

Gentlemen:

Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233. Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on

Constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

WILLIAM W. STOUFFER

ALICE A. STOUFFER